

cases or appeals dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim — unless the three-striker inmate shows “imminent danger of serious physical injury.” § 1915(g).

Renoir has brought such actions or appeals on three or more prior occasions. *See, e.g., Renoir v. Governor of Virginia*, 755 F. Supp. 2d 82 (D. D.C. 2010) (dismissed under § 1915(g)); *Renoir v. Davidson*, No. 08-cv-333, 2008 WL 2944893, at *1 (E.D. Wisc. 2008) (noting accumulation of three “strikes”); *Renoir v. Brown*, No. 07CV00166, 2007 WL 1052477, at *1 (W.D. Va. 2007) (“Renoir has ‘three strikes’ under § 1915(g).”); *Renoir v. Ray*, No. 7:06CV00164, 2006 WL 840313 (W.D. Va. 2006) (dismissed under § 1915(g), with finding that allegations also did not state any actionable § 1983 claim); *Renoir v. Wilson*, No. 7:99CV00810 (W.D. Va. 1999) (dismissed as frivolous). Accordingly, Renoir may proceed in forma pauperis (without prepayment of court filing fees) only if he states facts showing that he faces imminent danger of serious physical injury. § 1915(g). He makes no such showing in any of the notices of appeals he has submitted to this court.

Furthermore, all of the notices of appeal Renoir has submitted are untimely filed by many years. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1) (requiring notice of appeal be filed within 30 days after entry of judgment or order appealed from). Renoir’s submissions offer no argument or factual support on which his attempted appeals

could be deemed timely filed. Moreover, merely to docket a notice of appeal in many of the listed cases would require staff to retrieve the paper case file from archives. I find no justification for this expenditure of judicial resources for appeals that are clearly futile, based on the date of filing alone.

In addition, the appeals Renoir has attempted to file are futile for other reasons. The cases Renoir cites from this court were closed because Renoir himself withdrew them or because of Renoir's well-established "three strikes" status under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Three of the cases that he seeks to appeal do not even exist in this court's records, as they were filed in some other district court.

For the stated reasons, it is **ORDERED** that Renoir's submission, received on August 1, 2022, including ten self-titled notices of appeal in various long-closed case numbers, is hereby **DISMISSED** as futile and to prevent a frivolous use of judicial resources.

Renoir is hereby advised that he may appeal this dismissal order to the court of appeals, and the Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Renoir and to the court of appeals.

ENTER: August 3, 2022

/s/ JAMES P. JONES
Senior United States District Judge